



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

an old MS., not however, identical with *A*. The MSS. of the second part form two groups, *C B F H* and *D*; the original is, however, not extant. The printed text of the saga aims to be an exact orthographic copy of *A*, so far as it is extant; a lacuna of two leaves in the MS. (pp. 46–59) is filled from *C*, the second best MS. Following the text on every page are variants from *C B* and *E F* in normalized orthography. *D* is printed *in extenso* at the bottom of the page in a normalized form. The text of the Continuation is after *C*; a lacuna (pp. 129–134) is filled from *B*; the last page, illegible in the MS. (pp. 138–139), is also after *B (D)*; the last five lines of the text are after *H*; variants from *B D* follow the text on each page. The peculiar value of Prof. Kǫlbing's work is, of course, the publication of the MS. *A*, whose Norwegian orthography he has judiciously followed—how correctly will not appear until the printed text is compared with the MS. by Swedish critics. A detailed list of the dialectic peculiarities of the MS. ought certainly to have been given in the introduction. Instead of this the author very conveniently refers in a footnote to a forthcoming book by some one else. *ó*, represented in the text by *æ*, performs a double function in the MS. and should have been retained to the exclusion of such forms as *kæmr*, *mændi*, etc. The normalized orthography of the variants is marred by the differentiation of *æ* and *æ* contrary to the MSS. and the omission of *ó* of the MSS.—printed *o*. As both, however, are mentioned in the introduction they cannot mislead. The same may be said of two or three inconsistencies in the orthography of *D*, where forms of the word *kongr* are given by the older uncontracted *konungr* which is obsolete; *ll* and not *l* should stand before dentals in *mællti*, *mællt*, *skalltu*, *skylldi*. The book aside from these few faults bears throughout the marks of careful labor and discrimination, and ranks as a scientific work far above the author's *Riddara Sögur* (Strassburg and London, 1872). With the *Elis Saga* the author, as he states in his preface, closes his labors in Old Norse philology, a field where he has done abundant work, and where he will be reluctantly missed.

W. H. CARPENTER.

SOPHOCLES. Edited, with English notes and introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M. A., LL. D., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews. In two volumes. Vol. II: Ajax, Electra, Trachiniae, Philoctetes, Fragments. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1881.

Professor Campbell published Vol. I of his edition of Sophocles first in 1871 and again in 1879. A second edition of Vol. I was called for while Vol. II was still in preparation. This delay in the appearance of Vol. II was in some ways fortunate. Professor Campbell was thus enabled to reconsider the principles on which his work is based in the light of the criticisms elicited by Vol. I. The present volume exemplifies, it may fairly be concluded, the editor's matured conception of such an edition of Sophocles as he has proposed to himself—one, he says, which does not aim at the completeness of Boeckh's Pindar, but whose plan is rather that proposed by Hermann in his preface to the Ajax, "*quod instituerat Erfurditius, ut haec editio et adolescentium studiis accommodata esset, neque exclusa ab usu doctorum hominum.*" The criticisms

mentioned were numerous, a fact on which the editor doubtless congratulated himself, since it proves, on the well-known principle, the substantial value of his work. One of these, that of the regius professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, summed up finally in his *Studia Sophoclea*, Part I, is phenomenal among English reviews on account of its ferocity, and reminds one of the lamented Krüger. Dr. Kennedy's implacable and magisterial manner tempts Professor Campbell, who, with a Scotchman's power of resistance, refuses to be convinced, somewhere to remark with Socratic irony, ὦ γενναῖε, πρῶτερόν με προδίδασκε, ἵνα μὴ ἀποφοιτήσω ἀπὸ σοῦ.

The complete work has magnitude. It covers over 1200 octavo pages, and includes an introductory essay on the language of Sophocles of more than 100 pages, a full list of the MSS., with an examination of the question how the chief MS. stands related to the rest, introductions to the seven plays and to the fragments, a revision of the text, and continuous interpretation of this text in notes put where they always should be put, on the lower half of the same page.

This volume appears only a little later than Professor Paley's edition of the same four plays in the *Bibliotheca Classica*. Thus two complete editions of Sophocles have appeared in England since the first publishing of the last complete edition in Germany. Such literary activity is creditable to English scholarship; and one's satisfaction is increased by the rumor of another complete edition of the poet by Professor Jebb, to be published soon by the Cambridge University Press.

It is a relief to conservative scholars to know that both Professor Campbell and Professor Paley have refused to follow the principles laid down by C. G. Cobet, whose brilliant work in the field of conjectural criticism compels our admiration, though it fails to win our assent to his sweeping condemnation of existing Greek MSS.; and that in establishing their text of Sophocles they have not fallen into the dark errors of a school that will tolerate no deviation from its preconceived notions of Greek grammar, but ruthlessly squares the author in hand to its own ideas of what he should have written. The outcome of this principle is seen at its worst in the vagaries of Mr. Blaydes, the editor of the first volume on Sophocles in the *Bibliotheca Classica*, who to his discredit may fairly be said to have rewritten his author, "dealing with him as 'an accomplished master would treat the iambic exercises of an advanced pupil.'"¹ Professor Campbell, on the contrary, has adopted but few conjectures into the text of the plays,—twenty-one, by count, in the *Ajax*, two-thirds of which are in lyrical passages,—and these with few, if any, exceptions belong to Mr. Paley's category of corrections, "self-evidently either right or necessary," and have behind them the authority of great names. His critical apparatus is excellent, open to the apprehension of even an "adolescens," and sure to induce in him habits of proper respect for the authority of the MSS. There is no better edition than this with which to begin to study the text of Sophocles. The editor gives, perhaps, too much weight to the inferior MSS. There are occasional places where I think he would have done better to follow L. In *Phil.* 493, 494,² he is undoubtedly

¹ In the hands of such an editor,—οὐδαμῶς τιμαῖς *Σοφοκλῆς ἐμφανής* ἔρρει δὲ τὰ θεῖα.

² He reads,—

πατρί μ' ὡς δείξης φίλῳ,
ὃν δὴ παλαι' ἂν ἐξότου δέδοικ' ἐγὼ
μή μοι βεβήκη.

right in reading *παλαῖ ἄν*, and should have followed it up with *βεβήκοι*, completely parting company with the editors and adopting the reading of L. His text as it stands can hardly be interpreted. The supposition that *εἶη* is to be supplied is untenable, and in connecting the phrase *παλαῖ ἄν ἐξότου* with the last verb in the sentence he has himself supplied the key. If the particle *ἄν* is read, it belongs to *βεβήκοι*. The passage means,—“I fear that he would prove to be¹ long since gone.” Trach. 631 furnishes an exact parallel in the use of the mood to *δέδοικα μὴ βεβήκοι ἄν*.

It would be surprising if in a work of such magnitude as this the critic did not find what he regarded errors of commission and omission for which to bring the editor to book. It may not, for example—to continue with the Philoctetes—be ungracious to doubt whether Professor Campbell's note on 567² will gain credence. The passage when put side by side with vv. 253, 415, Elec. 1341, Trach. 289, can have but one interpretation. To supply *ἐστίν* here would be unusually harsh, and the order is adequately accounted for by the antithesis between *δρώμενα* and *μέλλοντα*. In none of these passages has the editor explained, or even noted, the subtle force of *ὥς*. He has also omitted any explanation of the rare aorists optative in 281, 282; and in the note on 961, the reference on *πρὶν μάθοιμι* (the mood does need explanation) to the note on 325 is not wholly satisfactory, since there is no note on 325.

Is it clear, further, in Ajax 1083 that *πεσεῖν* “denotes what is certain in the future,” and that it is not a gnomic aorist? Aesch. Prom. 667—cited as a parallel—since it involves a special reference to a particular person, is logically a very different case from this where the speaker gives utterance to a universal truth.³ Professor Campbell refuses to follow Elmsley's lead in making Trach. 979 interrogative. If he had not, such a passage as Phil. 381 would have presented insuperable difficulties. It would have been better, perhaps, if he had gone further and made such passages as Ajax 75 and Trach. 1183 also affirmative. Whether he would explain these as Professor Jebb does (on Ajax 75), or take the more logical view of making the second question independent of the *οὐ*, is uncertain. He has nothing to say on *οὐ μὴ* either in his notes on these places or in his introductory essay.

Professor Campbell occupies a singular position in regard to Greek metres. He mentions Rossbach and Westphal, and gives a hint of Heinrich Schmidt; he has partially and with some hesitation, he says, made use of terminology which has of late become current in Germany; but he does not wish to be understood as committing himself to any positive judgment. When, therefore, he speaks of syncope or an irrational syllable, he does not mean it. He adopts into his work the metrical sign of the triseme long syllable, but if you disbelieve in the existence or importance of such metrical phenomena you may pass it by; as for himself, according to his own statement, he is making up his mind. I do not wish to jest about a serious matter—for Professor Campbell has lost an excellent opportunity to enlighten a great many persons on an important subject—but surely all this is surprising.

¹ Cf. Thuc. i. 9, *αὔται δὲ οὐκ ἂν πολλὰ εἶσαν*. The conjecture *βέβηκε* is wholly unnecessary.

² *ὥς ταῦτ' ἐπίστω δρώμεν', οὐ μέλλοντ' ἔτι*.

³ Plat. Rep. 490 C is a parallel passage: *ἡγουμένης δὴ ἀληθείας οὐκ ἂν ποτε, οἷμαι, φαίμεν αὐτῇ χορὸν κακῶν ἀκολουθεῖν*.

Since Rossbach's book on *Griechische Rhythmik* appeared in 1854 the whole question of Greek rhythms has had a restatement; the literature of the subject is now formidable and deterrent. But the editor of so important a work as this may well be called upon to declare his opinion. Does he still believe in the existence of the twenty-eight feet recorded in that venerable book, the *Epitome Doctrinae Metricae*, or has he adopted the doctrine of syncope? Does he agree that the choruses of Sophocles were written to be sung, and agreeing, does he believe that the Greeks, differently from all the moderns, were able to shift within the compass of a few bars from triple to common, from three-eighths to five-eighths, time, and back again, and still have a melody? Professor Campbell in the division of the lines has refused to follow "recent innovations," and has nothing to say of the eurhythmical relations of the parts of the strophes to one another. Was Theodor Bergk, therefore, wrong when he said to Rossbach in 1847, "dass eine jede griechische Strophe ein Kunstwerk im vollen Sinne des Wortes sei, wo Alles auf architectonischer Gliederung beruhe und wo es nicht bloss auf den einzelnen Vers ankomme, sondern vor Allem darauf, wie der Vers zur Totalität der rhythmischen Composition passt"?

J. W. W.